Appl. No.: 10/644,841
Reply to Office action of Jan. 29, 2007

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. In response to your required restriction to one of 4 "species": A security system authorizing access to data as a result of disk related actions, communications related actions, Registry related actions, and memory related actions – we select the first species - A security system authorizing access to data as a result of disk actions. However, many of the claims have been amended or replaced and most of the claims belong now to the first species. Therefore, the list of claims which belong to this species are at least claims 1-5, 9-15, 20, 22, 28, 37, 42, 43, 46, 56, 58, 60-64, 66, 67, 69-86, 88, 90-93. Anyway, I respectfully submit that all the independent claims are now generic claims and should be allowed and therefore all of the dependent claims should also be examined and allowed. In addition, as far as I understand, at least the following dependent claims are generic and therefore should also be examined: 16, 19, 30, 38, 41, 45, 50, 54, 87 & 94. In addition, I would like to point out that since the independent claims now refer to disk related activities and/or are generic, other species which might be mentioned in some parts of dependent claims should also be examined since they are now dependent on the independent claims and therefore there is no problem of unity of invention. In addition, I would like to remind you that you stated in clause 3 of your examination report that independent claims 1 & 9 are currently regarded as generic and that the restriction will apply only if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable.

2. Any claims canceled or not elected are being canceled or not elected without prejudice and we reserve the right to reinstate them or other claims later in this application and/or in divisionals and/or in CIPs.

Respectfully submitted,
Yaron Mayer
/Yaron Mayer/